

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 13:44:20 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #264
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 27 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 264

Today's Topics:

 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs. (2 msgs)
 ARRL and it's members (3 msgs)
 Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References f
 Linn County (IA) Zoning Ordinance re: Communications Towers
 Real CBers
 Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1993 17:38:06 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Rev. Michael P. Deignan (kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com) wrote:
: Clearly not. Therefore, I've come to the conclusion that the 3A and 3B
: elements ought to be recombined, and the question pool re-written to
: shore up the theory. Then, modify the license requirements so that
: Techs, regardless of code level, should pass Element 3.

3B? I'd sure like to see the version of the question pool for that test
in the whatever wierd dimension you live in. HF band limits, Antennas,
propagation. The reason it's not combined is that the material tested

is irrelevant for VHF.

You don't have a clue what you're talking about, or you're just making stuff up to piss people off.

If you're going to combine things, just dump the stupid incentive licensing and adopt the Canadian two test system.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 18:17:02 GMT
From: taligent@apple.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@ames.arpa
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CArxt0.71x@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

>
>Some idiot wrote:

C'mon Swami, you want people to calm down and you start a message like this? Gack.

>>Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!
>
>>Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satellites?
>
>>Rev Rod Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)
>>My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.
>
>Calm down!!!!!! .._ .. _.. .. ___ _ .-.-.-

I'll translate Swami's little Morse message:
U IDIOT.

Are you trying to get someone to calm down? Or are you trying to make sure rec.radio.amateur.policy never discusses anything reasonably but instead remains a flaming war?

>Someone else wrote:
>
>>What's really interesting about being a no-coder on 2m is that there is
>>an unending stream of old farts with holier-than-thou attitudes who make the
>>band sound like CB by going on about 10-40 roger and all the good numbers.

>
>>I've never heard anything CB-ish uttered by anyone other than a VE3xx (that's
>>a full priv advanced class license with 10+ years). Seems that it must
>>be the code types that have the CB problem.
>
>>Perhaps if the old-farts-with-attitude spent some of their time doing
>>constructive things like HELPING PEOPLE LEARN CODE, rather than running
>>people down for not having the precious code, more people might learn it. On
>>the other hand, when they sit back and bitch about no-coders, they sound
>>just like the brain-dead goons on CB going on about how tough they are.
>
>___ _..._ _ .. _... _ _ _ _ _.

Swami sez:
OH, SHUT UP

Such mature, relaxing words.

>
>
>What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!
>I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!
>
>KB1AMB/AA

Is this the kettle calling the pot black?

--
* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 02:21:38 CDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@ames.arpa
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

hanko@mentorg.com (Hank Oredson) writes:

> In article <1993Jul26.003552.3847@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, rcanders@nyx.cs.du.ed
> |> In article <1993Jul25.155334.14707@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com
> |> >robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
> |> >

> |> >>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
> |> >>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
> |> >>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.
> |> >
> |> >Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get th
> |> >wrong idea...) but the League's original proposal in 1989 to the FCC for
> |> >codeless license did not grant 2mtr privs to codeless techs, other than
> |> >the "data" portion for packet radio use.
> |> >
> |> >Personally, I would have much rather saw the Codeless Tech license grante
> |> >the same privs above 30mhz that Novices are -- with perhaps an additional
> |> >band or two to "save that bandwidth".
> |> >
> |> >M
> |> >
> |> Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!
> |> >
> |> Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satellites?
> |> >
> |> Rev Rod Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)
> |> My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.
> |> >
> >
> Ho Ho Ha Ha ... giggle giggle ...
> >
> |> >
> |> --
> |> Rod Anderson NONZO | "I do not think the United States government
> |> Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
> |> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
> |> satellite NONZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate
> >
> --
> >
> Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
> Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
> Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Ins't it great to be a member of a hobby, where all the members join
together and rally toward a common goal? <grin>

--Robert

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 06:33:39 CDT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> I think the ARRL has done good and bad.... The biggest problem is
> that it looks like we're stuck with a 1 party system. A little
> competition usually helps both sides improve their quality of service.

That's not entirely true. There is also the National Amateur Radio Association, although they seem to primarily cater to new hams entering the hobby through the Codeless Technician route. They send issues sporadically to "noted amateurs" (I guess I'm one of those). Judging from the content, I think the League has little to worry about.

> 73, 10-4 and all those good numbers. (Sickening, isn't it?!)
Indeed.

> 73 de N8VUR
--Robert

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 02:32:27 CDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@ames.arpa
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

> Speaking of laying cards on the table, I have seen this sentiment posted
> by a few in the current ARRL is good/bad thread, but the specifics
> have been missing. I would like to ask the following:
>
> Do you feel that there is nothing that the ARRL has done in the past few
> years that represents you?
>
> Or, do you feel that our actions on one or more specific issues have
> been against what you feel to be your best interests?
>
> I am sincere -- I would like to see the grievances aired. I think I can
> point out quite a few things that we have done that have helped most
> hams, amateurs, so I suspect that most anti-ARRL sentiment is probably
> based on the second issue.

Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL *is* the representative organization by and for the amateur radio community in

the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now have something completely different than what we approved?

--Robert

Date: 27 Jul 93 17:42:14 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <sg6B8B6w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>> Or, do you feel that our actions on one or more specific issues have
>> been against what you feel to be your best interests?

>>

>> I am sincere -- I would like to see the grievances aired. I think I can
>> point out quite a few things that we have done that have helped most
>> hams, amateurs, so I suspect that most anti-ARRL sentiment is probably
>> based on the second issue.

>

>Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered
>around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL *is* the
>representative organization by and for the amateur radio community in
>the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support
>from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that
>a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all
>amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

>

>My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now
>have something completely different than what we approved?

The proposal didn't pass because the ARRL doesn't have the FCC completely in their back pocket. The ARRL is *an* organization that attempts to speak for amateur radio, and the largest one because it publishes a magazine, but it is not alone. The QCWA, AMSAT, TAPR, and others, including individual amateurs such as myself, made themselves heard on the issue by filing comments with the FCC. Those others convinced the FCC that a ghettoized license was not in the best interests of amateur radio, or the new licensees. They pointed out successfully that the required socialization of the new licensees requires that they be exposed to existing licensees. Existing

licensees are primarily on 2 meters. The relative failure of the 220 Novice license showed that putting the newcomers off to themselves led to several ills, mainly a failure to learn mainstream amateur operating practices.

This has worked very well in our area. We are now seeing real growth in our amateur clubs for the first time in 25 years as these newcomers have been welcomed to two meters by our club members and shown the ropes of amateur operation in an open and friendly way. We're seeing real growth in 440 and 222 MHz systems as two begins to be busier. We're even seeing activity on 902 and 1296 thanks to the new blood giving our clubs the boost they needed to get off the dime and explore the additional spectrum. Since no-code, we've seen two ATV repeaters started primarily at the instigation of newcomers who wanted to try the mode. Our packet networks have expanded dramatically thanks mainly to the fresh blood entering the service. We've also gotten a few more lids, but we had lids before. The absolute numbers have increased a bit, but the percentage hasn't changed, likely it's actually declined since most of the newcomers want to be accepted and try very hard to adopt standard practices. We hear new calls on our machines almost every week now, and many of them have little clue as to proper operating procedure. But we've found that an open and friendly greeting leads to them emulating our practices in short order without our having to chastize them, which usually just makes a pissed off enemy rather than a new friend anyway.

We were all beginners once. None of us knew all the ins and outs of operating procedure when we were first licensed. Most of us in the 1950s and 60s soon met a friendly amateur who clued us in on how to do things and introduced us to his friends who also welcomed us and offered their help. Somewhere about 1968 that disappeared as a caste system was introduced to amateur radio. Now some of us are finally trying to undo the damage that caused.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 02:31:49 GMT
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!sage.cc.purdue.edu!blumb@purdue.edu
Subject: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org> cowan@balsam.pinetree.org (Darin

Cowan) writes:

>swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

>> >Perhaps if the old-farts-with-attitude spent some of their time doing
>> >constructive things like HELPING PEOPLE LEARN CODE, rather than running
>> >people down for not having the precious code, more people might learn it. 0
>> >the other hand, when they sit back and bitch about no-coders, they sound
>> >just like the brain-dead goons on CB going on about how tough they are.

>>

>> _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

>

> "Oh, shut up" - now there's an interesting and informative comment.

>

>>

>> What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!

>> I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!

>>

>> KB1AMB/AA

>>

>

>I hope they are. They might as well learn about some of the contemptible
>individuals in the hobby who are so egotistical that they would look down
>on a new ham because the newbie hasn't learned code.

>

>I suspect that the people involved in such snobbery really have no other
>way to demonstrate any kind of superiority over anyone. Being complete
>failures in other walks of life, their status as ham radio masters gives them
>the self-actualization they need. Rather than help others, it becomes more
>important to these people to establish dominance and prove their self-evident
>greatness.

I'm a Prospective Ham. :-)

I've got my study guides, etc.

I have the ARRL New Ham package.

I'm getting ready for the test.

And I'm sick of people telling me I must learn code.

What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?

What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?

Not much.

--

Bill Blum blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu Purdue University, W. Lafayette, IN
Financial Counseling & Planning Major, School of Consumer and Family Sci.
It's not the miles that I must drive, or the endless questions in my mind
It's all the birds that I can see, and the soaring circles that they fly....

Date: 27 Jul 93 18:37:28 GMT
From: concert!samba.oit.unc.edu!cheech@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul24.031013.4221@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

>

>>In a few years No-Coders will be the "*majority*" or
>>amateur radio operators.

>

>Doubtful, since a majority of the no-code licensees are upgrading,
>according to VECs.

>

>MD

Yes Rev., in a few years the undercover No-Code Techs will be the majority of amateur radio operators. And we're a lot harder to identify.

Take it easy,

Greg AC4YT
Undercover No-Code Technician

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 02:10:43 CDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@ames.arpa
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References f
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>

> Thank you, Paul. New hams will spend their money on the radio which
> will get them the most people to talk to. So happens that 2m is where the
> party is, that is where the new people will go, too.
I hate to be a "party pooper" Dana, but I believe there are more people to talk to on, say 20 or 15 meters, than two meters. I'm delighted to hear that all the new hams will go there, though.

> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *
I believe that's obvious. Would you support beefed-up written exams, with perhaps the removal of the published question pool?

--Robert

Date: 27 Jul 93 17:42:31 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Linn County (IA) Zoning Ordinance re: Communications Towers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Summary..too much to post it all and i don't have it in electronic form - Bill

June 23, 1993

BACKGROUND

Commercial radio and television towers and broadcasting stations are conditional uses in the A(Agricultural) District and are principal permitted uses in the I-2 (Heavy Industrial) District. Similarly, cellular and microwave have been treated as other commercial communications providers.

Requests by ham operators for locating towers in residential and agricultural zones have been treated as an accessory use, but subject to yard setback requirements and height limitations (35 feet).

PROPOSED CHANGES

- 1) Only allow commercial communication towers, as a conditional use in the A(Agricultural) District and in the I-2 (Heavy Industrial) District, subject to meeting all the requirements set forth in the proposed Communication Tower ordinance.
- 2) Allow amateur radio towers only in the A(Agricultural) District and the AR (Agricultural-Residential) District. Such towers would be treated as an allowed principal permitted use up to 70 feet in height or 80 feet in height with an antenna. If the tower exceeds 70 feet in height the property owner would have to obtain a conditional use permit. Again, amateur radio towers would have to meet all requirements as set forth in the proposed Communication Tower Ordinance.

(goes on for 11-12 pages...)

more info from Tom, NY0V...

Cedar Rapids now has it's own tower ordinance - with a permitted-by-right limit of 70 feet and maximum antenna height of 80 feet. If you are under the 70/80 foot limit, all you need is a building permit. If you go higher you need

a conditional use permit..

All of this regulation because of a freak accident last summer with a 425 foot commercial tower.

--==--

for what it's worth....73, bill wb9ivr

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 06:26:51 CDT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cthomas@athena.mit.edu (Michael T Ford) writes:

> In article <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami K
> >
> >-... . -.----- .- -- -... .- .-
> >
> >
> >
> -. . -.. -. -. .- .- ... --- -. ---. --. .- .-
> -. . .-- --.. ----- -. .

Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.

--Robert

Date: 27 Jul 93 19:07:36 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srigenprp!
alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Mark Monninger (markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com) wrote:

: Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people
: have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by
: ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum
: it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one
: sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

Same here. Another thing I hate is when the radio ad gives you the

telephone number in letters rather than numbers ("Dial 1-800-GET-LOST").
Takes much longer to dial that way.

AL N1AL

Date: 27 Jul 1993 15:29:38 GMT
From: news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@seismo.css.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.144236.25076@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<CAKz25.751@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <CAsACL.4v5@squam.banyan.com>
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

|In article <CAKz25.751@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:
||> When the Novice license was introduced in the 50's it was for a 1-year
||> term and NON-RENEWABLE. It was considered a temporary beginners license.
||> After a year, you upgraded or lost your ham license forever.
||>
||> AL N1AL

|
|And unless you had a good support network of local Elmers, that's
|exactly what happened, you never got on the air and the license
|expired. That's what happened to WN1SMS, which I held in the early
|70's. It wasn't 'till the nocode was added that I even bothered to get
|a license again. Sure it only took me a week or two to get back up to
|5 WPM, but I had other things to keep me busy.

|
|Back at the age of 12, it took me 6 months to get a receiver (that
|drifted badly) and I never did get a transmitter. I did not have a
|parent who was a ham, and did not know any hams in the community.
|Non-renewable, short-term licenses are really not the answer...

Sounds just like my story, and I agree.

from KN7YEG (1963-4)
continuously licenced since May '92
but eligible for membership in QCWA (!)

/JBL kd1on

(Daniel -- shorten your lines, thanks)

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com |
pots: (617)873-3463 |
KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

"I gotta go."
-- I. Shoales

Date: 27 Jul 93 18:00:19 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.144236.25076@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<CAKz25.751@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>, <231qfnINNsgp@kralizec.zeta.org.au>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In article <231qfnINNsgp@kralizec.zeta.org.au> craig@kralizec.zeta.org.au (Craig Dewick) writes:

>
>At the moment I have no amateur licesne, and like many others, find morse
>both intimidating and unnecessary. Why, with so much development in
>packet and other forms of radio comms, should we be forced to learn
>morse?

Good question. My answer is that you shouldn't be *forced* to learn Morse. Having said that, and being one of the primary advocates of other communications methods than the antique make/break encoding, I should say that you *may* want to learn some Morse at a later date for certain modes of operating. It's still useful for simple QRP operation, and it's still used at times for such exotic modes as amateur satellites, and most definitely for moonbounce. It depends on what you decide you want to *do* in amateur radio whether you need to learn Morse or not. If data, voice, and image communications are all that interest you, then you'll probably never find a use for Morse. However, if you decide that weak signal work, or heaven forbid, DXing become interests of yours, then learning some Morse may be useful to you. Or, lacking Morse skill, you may be forced to develop new technologies to accomplish those tasks. That would also be good for amateur radio.

I suspect that many of the rabid advocates of full Morse testing are really afraid that if they don't have a way to *force* others to learn their preferred mode, they may soon find themselves with no one with whom to practice their peculiar talents. Many others just want to limit membership in their exclusive club and find Morse hazing a convenient method.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary

Lawrenceville, GA 30244 |

Date: 27 Jul 93 18:32:11 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!gatech!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!concert!samba.oit.unc.edu!
cheech@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <2374@indep1.UUCP>eech
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <2374@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
> Frankly, my idea of a really good Extra Class test would be to lock
>the applicant in a room with two or three old TVs and AM radios and give
>him three hours to get a message out from inside the room, using an
>amateur frequency in any mode he chose. I'll bet those who did it
>successfully (all three of them) would be using CW.
>| Cliff Sharp | clifto@indep1.chi.il.us OR clifto@indep1.uucp |

I *like* this idea. Although you are really going overboard on the
available materials. One TV and a soldering iron should do the job
nicely. Well, throw in a pair of diagonal cutters.

Another possibility would be to make the TVs B&W. The colorburst
crystal just makes it too easy.

I also think extra credit should be available for using the speaker
as a speaker/mic.

Take it easy,

Greg AC4YT
Undercover No-Code Technician

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #264
